

DOE does not have a quantitative estimate of uncertainty associated with the ground water modeling predictions estimating the time for ground water concentrations to reach levels protective of aquatic species. Specifically, transport parameters (e.g., tailings seepage concentration and the natural degradation of ammonia in the subsurface) were found to have a much greater impact on predicted concentrations than did flow parameters (e.g., hydraulic conductivity and effective porosity). The sensitivity analysis performed indicates that perturbing the key transport parameters from the calibrated values could result in either significantly higher or significantly lower contaminant concentrations in the ground water adjacent to the river: it did not indicate the probability or likelihood of any one outcome.

Many variables affect prediction accuracy, and the system of contaminant transport and the interaction between ground water and surface are complex, largely due to the dynamic nature of river stage and backwater area morphology. To compensate for the inherent uncertainties, DOE has assumed a conservative protective water quality goal of meeting the lowest possible acute aquatic standard (based on the range of observed pH and temperature conditions in the river) in the ground water with no consideration of dilution. DOE's model predictions, supported by site-specific data, indicate that long-term ground water concentrations adjacent to the river would be protective for chronic exposure scenarios for all but the worst-case pH and temperature conditions without any consideration of dilution from the surface water.

Ground Water Remediation Conservation Measures

On the basis of site-specific data and its study of site conditions, DOE claims, in their BA, to possess a reasonable degree of confidence that protective conditions would be met and maintained during both the operation of the corrective action and following achievement of water quality goals. To ensure that protective conditions were met:

1. DOE would monitor the ground water and surface water systems, and report the results to the USFWS annually, by January 30 for the preceding year.
2. DOE would hold regular consultations with USFWS, on at least an annual basis.
3. DOE commits to conduct active remediation, which would continue throughout the projected 75-year remedial action period to achieve the target goal of 3 mg/L ammonia or less in ground water and into the post-remedial action confirmation monitoring period. This is anticipated to meet acute and chronic standards in surface water, combined with 10-fold dilution.
4. If an evaporation pond were used as part of ground water remediation, DOE commits to qualitative monitoring for general wildlife use. If any listed species frequented the evaporation pond, DOE would consult with USFWS to develop reasonable and prudent

Description of the Project Area

DOE's preliminary consultations and investigations indicate that listed threatened or endangered terrestrial wildlife species are not known to occur, nor are they strongly expected to occur, at the Crescent Junction site. However, before developing any disposal site, DOE, in consultation with USFWS, would determine the need for additional habitat evaluations and surveys for species that

Mr. Donald Metzler

could be affected. If threatened or endangered species or critical habitats were identified at a selected site, a mitigation plan would be developed to minimize potential adverse impacts. If impacts could not be avoided, additional Section 7 consultation would be required.

Moab Site: Terrestrial Setting - Historically, the entire Moab Site has been created and altered by natural events such as floods and, more recently, by the activities related to milling operations. At present, significant vegetation does not occur on approximately 380 acres of the site; this severely limits use of this area by terrestrial wildlife. Mature tamarisk, with minimal understory, covers approximately 50 acres of the site east of the tailings pile on the Colorado River floodplain. This area provides some habitat for birds and small mammals. Steep rock mesas dominate the area just west of the site. Low-growing desert shrub communities and low-density piñon-juniper forest are the predominant vegetation types to the west and north of the site along the transportation routes.

The upland soils at the site are Nakai sandy loam. The potential indigenous vegetation that might occur if the site were not disturbed from past mill operations includes grasses such as Indian ricegrass (*Achnatherum hymenoides*) and galleta (*Pleuraphis jamesii*) and the desert shrubs fourwing saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), shadscale (*Atriplex confertifolia*), and winterfat (*Krascheninnikovia lanata*). This potential vegetation could provide habitat for small mammals, including white-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys leucurus*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), and black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*). Fourwing saltbush, shadscale, and galleta may be used to some extent by mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) as forage.

The existing vegetation reflects a history of disturbance. Plants observed during April 2003 include spike dropseed (*Sporobolus contractus*), sand dropseed (*Sporobolus cryptandrus*), tamarisk (*Tamarix parviflora*), black greasewood (*Sarcobatus vermiculatus*), gray rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*), Douglas rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus viscidiflorus*), big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), and galleta. The presence of tamarisk and low-density black greasewood indicates that ground water occurs within 20 to 50 ft of the surface.

A narrow strip of riparian habitat along the eastern site boundary between the upper floodplain terrace and the Colorado River also contains wetland plants and soils. This area includes the sandbar areas downstream of Moab Wash. The area was assessed but not formally delineated in February 2002. The presence of wetland vegetation and soils and predominance of water would likely qualify at least a portion (estimated at approximately 1 acre) of this area as U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands. Seedling tamarisk is the predominant plant in these wetland areas; other wetland plants include saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), cattail (*Typha sp.*), rush (*Juncus sp.*), bulrush (*Scirpus sp.*), spikerush (*Eleocharis sp.*), redroot flat sedge (*Cyperus erythrorhizos*), and sandbar willow (*Salix exigua*).

Other riparian areas at the Moab Site do not meet the criteria for classification as jurisdictional wetlands. These include the wooded areas of tamarisk and other species on the floodplain and an area of woody and emergent vegetation surrounding a holding pond for water pumped from the river.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Vegetation across the Colorado River, including the Scott M. Matheson Wetlands Preserve (Matheson Wetlands Preserve) on the river's east bank, includes habitat that consists of riparian woodland, grassland, and shadscale (saltbush) communities. Woodland, dominated by tree species such as black willow (*Salix nigra*) and Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), is present in the preserve. Other plants include tamarisk, sedges (*Carex* spp.), bulrush, and cattail (NRC 1999). More than 175 species of birds have been observed at the Matheson Wetlands Preserve, and a great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*) rookery is present in its lower end (NRC 1999). The Matheson Wetlands Preserve has a variety of wetland types that include emergent wetlands, shrub wetlands, cottonwood stands, and ponds. It is the only sizable wetland remaining on the Colorado River in Utah and serves multiple environmental functions, including water quality preservation, flood protection, erosion control, and biological productivity and diversity.

Moab Site: Aquatic Setting - The Moab Site lies immediately adjacent to the Colorado River, the principal surface water resource for the area. The tailings pile is approximately 700 ft west of the river. The site is located on an alluvial terrace, which historically floods through the area, along the Moab Wash and into the Colorado River. The tailings pile is located within the 100-year recurrence interval storm floodplain of the Colorado River and within the floodplain of the probable maximum flood (PMF) of both the Colorado River and Moab Wash. Mussetter and Harvey (1994) identified two Colorado River flows that are significant for the Moab Site. At a flow of approximately 40,000 cfs, the river elevation exceeds its banks and floods the Matheson Wetlands Preserve. There were a total of seven years from 1959 to 2002 when flows were greater than 40,000 cfs. The other critical flow occurs at about 70,000 cfs, which, according to Mussetter and Harvey (1994), produces a river elevation such that river water comes in contact with the toe of the tailings pile. Based on an analysis of the flow data from the gaging station upstream at Cisco, there has only been one day (in 1984) since 1959 in which the flow has exceeded 70,000 cfs. Section 3.1.8 of the EIS and Section 5.2 of the SOWP (DOE 2003a) provide further discussion of the floodplains and hydrology. The major tributaries of the Colorado River near the site include the Dolores River (located upstream) and the Green River (located downstream). The Matheson Wetlands Preserve is on the east bank of the Colorado River, across from the Moab Site. Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.7 of the EIS and Gardner and Solomon (2004) describe the geology and surface water further.

The aquatic species within the vicinity of the Moab Site are associated with the Colorado River. The Colorado River has seasonal variations in flow and temperature following a snowpack-driven hydrograph (DOE 2003b). Aquatic species in the river have adapted to physical and chemical conditions that fluctuate naturally, both seasonally and daily. These conditions include river flow and flooding of intermittent backwaters and elevated floodplains, bottom scouring by sand and silt, temperature, sediment loading, chemical composition, and salinity (NRC 1999).

The Moab Site is located at approximately river mile 64 on the Colorado River (NRC 1999) in a transition zone between two geomorphically distinct reaches. River miles on the Colorado River have been designated for the purposes of research programs; the beginning of the designation is at the confluence of the Green River into the Colorado River (Belknap and Belknap 1991; Osmundson et al. 1997). The immediate reach of the Colorado River upstream of the site is predominantly sand-bedded with a few cobble bars. Directly downstream of the site, the river is sand-bedded with sandbars and stabilized islands. A portion of the shoreline near the site has

Mr. Donald Metzler

been stabilized by tamarisk, an invasive species, or stabilized with riprap. The tamarisk can form cut banks that erode to some degree with each large flood. The shoreline at the Matheson Wetlands Preserve opposite the site has been diked and is heavily colonized by tamarisk (NPS 2003).

The State of Utah has classified the river segment adjacent to the Moab Site as protected for warm-water species of game fish and other warm-water aquatic life, including necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain. Macroinvertebrate samples were collected at six locations in the vicinity of the site in 1999 (USGS 2002). At each location, a sample was collected 3 ft, 15 ft, and 30 ft from the shoreline. Over 40 macroinvertebrate taxa, including chironomids and oligochaetes, were found during this sampling effort. Rooted macrophytes (i.e., plants), along with algae and zooplankton, have been found in the intermittent backwater areas but are almost nonexistent in the main channel (NRC 1999). The backwaters and inundated floodplains often serve as important nurseries and forage suppliers for fish, including the endangered Colorado pikeminnow (Valdez and Wick 1983). Both native and non-native species are present in this reach of the Colorado River, including four federal endangered species (NRC 1999). Trammell and Chart found twelve non-native species and only five native species in surveys conducted from 1992 through 1996 (Trammell and Chart 1998).

Many components of the upper Colorado River ecosystem have changed over the last several decades. One change that affects the aquatic life of the river near Moab is the establishment of introduced, or non-native, fish species. The upper basin contains about 20 species of warm-water, non-native fish (USFWS 2002a). The red shiner (*Cyprinella lutrensis*), common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), channel catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*), northern pike (*Esox lucius*), and green sunfish (*Lepomis cyanellus*) are the non-natives considered by Colorado River Basin researchers to be of greatest concern because of their suspected or documented negative interactions with native fishes (USFWS 2002a). These introductions, in concert with the physical and chemical alterations of the river, may have contributed to the decline of the native fish populations (Trammell and Chart 1999, NRC 1999, Muth et al. 2000; USFWS 2002a). Chapter 3.0 of the EIS describes the aquatic setting further.

Off-Site Disposal Site: Crescent Junction - The proposed Crescent Junction disposal site is located on BLM-administered lands about 2 miles north of the town of Crescent Junction, which is an interchange on I-70 and US-191. The site is about 30 miles north of the Moab Site and covers several square miles of largely desert terrain that is bordered on the north by the prominent Book Cliffs. No perennial streams are present, but ephemeral streams may carry high flows during heavy rains. Because no perennial streams or other surface water bodies are present on the Crescent Junction site, aquatic ecological resources and wetlands would not be adversely affected by activities at this site. The State of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources in their DEIS comment letter to DOE, dated January 31, 2005, identified concerns for several state sensitive species at this site, including the white tailed prairie dog. In addition, some herpetile species may be dependent on ephemeral wash habitats.

In most areas of the site, vegetation is indicative of disturbance and varies from the potential native vegetation. About 50 percent of the Crescent Junction site is covered by very sparse low-growing vegetation. The northern part of the site is covered with a gray veneer of debris from a

Mr. Donald Metzler

recent outwash originating in the nearby Mancos Shale hills. The outwash area is mostly bare with some prickly pear cactus, cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), and Russian thistle (*Salsola kali*). Vegetation in the south-central and southeast portions of the site also consists primarily of these three species with a few native shrubs and perennial grasses, including gardner saltbush, galleta, and Indian ricegrass. Range condition in this area would probably rate as poor to fair.

Vegetation in the southwest portion of the site is probably influenced by a shallow aquifer and consists of sparse shrubs, including black greasewood, shadscale, and gardner saltbush. Understory vegetation consists primarily of annual weeds, such as cheatgrass and Russian thistle, with a few perennial grasses (galleta, Indian ricegrass). Tamarisk occurs occasionally in the drainages.

Water bodies in the vicinity of the Crescent Junction site consist of ephemeral washes that are dry most of the year. The water from these washes eventually flows into the Green River. There are no known wetlands in the area.

Transportation to the Crescent Junction site would be along US-191 or the Union Pacific Railroad. A slurry pipeline would follow existing natural gas pipeline rights-of-way. Transportation to the Crescent Junction site would also pass through the canyon area north of Moab.

Borrow Areas – DOE's preliminary consultations and investigations do not indicate the presence of threatened or endangered species at borrow sites. However, the proposed borrow areas may need further evaluation to determine habitat, species presence, and other ecological characteristics. Preliminary evaluations of these areas indicate that no aquatic resources are present. Before developing any borrow area, DOE, in consultation with USFWS and BLM, would determine the need for habitat evaluations and surveys for species that may be affected. If threatened or endangered species or critical habitats were identified on a selected area, a mitigation plan would be developed or a different borrow area would be selected, in order to minimize or eliminate impacts. If impacts could not be avoided, additional Section 7 consultation would be required. See the DEIS for a contemporary description of ten proposed borrow areas.

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT

Colorado Pikeminnow

Species/Critical Habitat Description

The Colorado pikeminnow is the largest cyprinid fish (minnow family) native to North America and evolved as the main predator in the Colorado River system. It is an elongated pike-like fish that during predevelopment times may have grown as large as 6 feet in length and weighed nearly 100 pounds (Behnke and Benson 1983). Today, Colorado pikeminnow rarely exceed 3 feet in length or weigh more than 18 pounds; such fish are estimated to be 45-55 years old (Osmundson et al. 1997). The mouth of this species is large and nearly horizontal with long slender pharyngeal teeth (located in the throat), adapted for grasping and holding prey. The diet

Mr. Donald Metzler

of Colorado pikeminnow longer than 3 or 4 inches consists almost entirely of other fishes (Vanicek and Kramer 1969). Males become sexually mature earlier and at a smaller size than do females, though all are mature by about age 7 and 500 mm (20 inches) in length (Vanicek and Kramer 1969, Seethaler 1978, Hamman 1981). Adults are strongly countershaded with a dark, olive back, and a white belly. Young are silvery and usually have a dark, wedge-shaped spot at the base of the caudal fin.

Critical habitat, as defined in section 3(5)(A) of the Act, means: (i) the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the species at the time it is listed . . . , on which are found those physical or biological features (I) essential to the conservation of the species and (II) which may require special management considerations or protection; and (ii) specific areas outside the geographic area occupied by a species at the time it is listed . . . , upon a determination by the Secretary that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species.@

Designated critical habitat for the endangered Colorado River fishes includes those portions of the 100-year floodplain that contain constituent elements. The constituent elements are those physical and biological features that the USFWS considers essential for the conservation of the species and include, but are not limited to, the following items: (1) Space for individual and population growth, and for normal behavior; (2) Food, water, air, light, minerals, or other nutritional or physiological requirements; (3) Cover or shelter; (4) Sites for breeding, reproduction, rearing of offspring, germination, or seed dispersal; and generally (5) Habitats that are protected from disturbance or are representative of the historical geographical and ecological distributions of the species. The primary constituent elements determined necessary for the survival and recovery of the four endangered Colorado River fishes include, but are not limited to:

Water - A quantity of water of sufficient quality (i.e., temperature, dissolved oxygen, lack of contaminants, nutrients, turbidity, etc.) that is delivered to a specific location in accordance with a hydrologic regime that is required for the particular life stage for each species;

Physical Habitat - Areas of the Colorado River system that are inhabited or potentially habitable by fish for use in spawning, nursing, feeding, and rearing, or corridors between these areas. In addition to river channels these areas also include bottom lands, side channels, secondary channels, oxbows, backwaters, and other areas in the 100-year floodplain, which when inundated provide spawning, nursery, feeding, and rearing habitats, or access to these habitats;

Biological Environment - Food supply, predation, and competition are important elements of the biological environment and are considered components of this constituent element. Food supply is a function of nutrient supply, productivity, and availability to each life stage of the species. Predation and competition, although considered normal components of this environment, are out of balance due to introduced nonnative fish species in many areas.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Designated critical habitat makes up about 29% of the species' original range and occurs exclusively in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Critical habitat has been designated within the 100-year floodplain of the Colorado pikeminnow's historical range in the following sections of the Upper Basin, excluding the San Juan River Basin (59 FR 13374).

Colorado, Moffat County. The Yampa River and its 100-year floodplain from the State Highway 394 bridge in T. 6 N., R. 91 W., section 1 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah, Carbon, Grand, Emery, Wayne, and San Juan Counties; and Colorado, Moffat County. The Green River and its 100-year floodplain from the confluence with the Yampa River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Colorado River in T. 30 S., R. 19 E., section 7 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Colorado, Rio Blanco County; and Utah, Uintah County. The White River and its 100-year floodplain from Rio Blanco Lake Dam in T. 1 N., R. 96 W., section 6 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 9 S., R. 20 E., section 4 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Colorado, Delta and Mesa Counties. The Gunnison River and its 100-year floodplain from the confluence with the Uncompahgre River in T. 15 S., R. 96 W., section 11 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Colorado River in T. 1 S., R. 1 W., section 22 (Ute Meridian).

Colorado, Mesa and Garfield Counties; and Utah, Grand, San Juan, Wayne, and Garfield Counties. The Colorado River and its 100-year floodplain from the Colorado River Bridge at exit 90 north off Interstate 70 in T. 6 S., R. 93 W., section 16 (6th Principal Meridian) to North Wash, including the Dirty Devil arm of Lake Powell up to the full pool elevation, in T. 33 S., R. 14 E., section 29 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Status and Distribution

Based on early fish collection records, archaeological finds, and other observations, the Colorado pikeminnow was once found throughout warmwater reaches of the entire Colorado River Basin down to the Gulf of California, and including reaches of the upper Colorado River and its major tributaries, the Green River and its major tributaries, and the Gila River system in Arizona (Seethaler 1978). Colorado pikeminnow apparently were never found in colder, headwater areas. The species was abundant in suitable habitat throughout the entire Colorado River Basin prior to the 1850s (Seethaler 1978). By the 1970s they were extirpated from the entire lower basin (downstream of Glen Canyon Dam) and portions of the upper basin as a result of major alterations to the riverine environment. Having lost some 75 to 80 percent of its former range due to habitat loss, the Colorado pikeminnow was federally listed as an endangered species in 1967 (Miller 1961, Moyle 1976, Tyus 1991, Osmundson and Burnham 1998). Full protection under the Act of 1973 occurred on January 4, 1974.

Colorado pikeminnow are presently restricted to the Upper Colorado River Basin and inhabit warmwater reaches of the Colorado, Green, and San Juan rivers and associated tributaries. The Colorado pikeminnow recovery goals (USFWS 2002a) identify occupied habitat of wild Colorado pikeminnow as follows: the Green River from Lodore Canyon to the confluence of the Colorado River; the Yampa River downstream of Craig, Colorado; the Little Snake River from its confluence with the Yampa River upstream into Wyoming; the White River downstream of Taylor Draw Dam; the lower 89 miles of the Price River; the lower Duchesne River; the upper Colorado River from Palisade, Colorado, to Lake Powell; the lower 34 miles of the Gunnison River; the lower mile of the Dolores River; and 150 miles of the San Juan River downstream from Shiprock, New Mexico, to Lake Powell.

Recovery goals for the Colorado pikeminnow (USFWS 2002a) were approved on August 1, 2002. According to these recovery goals, downlisting can be considered if, over a 5-year period:

- a genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining population is maintained in the Green River subbasin such that (a) the trends in separate adult (age 7+; > 450 mm total length) point estimates for the middle Green River and the lower Green River do not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-6 (400–449 mm total length) naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for the Green River subbasin, and (c) each population point estimate for the Green River subbasin exceeds 2,600 adults (2,600 is the estimated minimum viable population needed to ensure long-term genetic and demographic viability); and
- a self-sustaining population of at least 700 adults (number based on inferences about carrying capacity) is maintained in the upper Colorado River subbasin such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-6 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality; and
- a target number of 1,000 age-5+ fish (> 300 mm total length; number based on estimated survival of stocked fish and inferences about carrying capacity) is established through augmentation and/or natural reproduction in the San Juan River subbasin; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been identified, developed, and implemented.

Delisting can be considered if, over a 7-year period beyond downlisting:

- a genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining population is maintained in the Green River subbasin such that (a) the trends in separate adult point estimates for the middle Green River and the lower Green River do not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-6 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for the

Mr. Donald Metzler

Green River subbasin, and (c) each population point estimate for the Green River subbasin exceeds 2,600 adults; and

- either the upper Colorado River subbasin self-sustaining population exceeds 1,000 adults or the upper Colorado River subbasin self-sustaining population exceeds 700 adults and San Juan River subbasin population is self-sustaining and exceeds 800 adults (numbers based on inferences about carrying capacity) such that for each population (a) the trend in adult point estimates does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-6 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been finalized and implemented, and necessary levels of protection are attained.

Life History

The Colorado pikeminnow is a long-distance migrator; adults move hundreds of miles to and from spawning areas, and require long sections of river with unimpeded passage. Adults require pools, deep runs, and eddy habitats maintained by high spring flows. These high spring flows maintain channel and habitat diversity, flush sediments from spawning areas, rejuvenate food production, form gravel and cobble deposits used for spawning, and rejuvenate backwater nursery habitats. Spawning occurs after spring runoff at water temperatures typically between 18 and 23°C. After hatching and emerging from spawning substrate, larvae drift downstream to nursery backwaters that are restructured by high spring flows and maintained by relatively stable base flows. Flow recommendations have been developed that specifically consider flow-habitat relationships in habitats occupied by Colorado pikeminnow in the upper basin, and were designed to enhance habitat complexity and to restore and maintain ecological processes. The following is a description of observed habitat uses in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Colorado pikeminnow live in warm-water reaches of the Colorado River mainstem and larger tributaries, and require uninterrupted stream passage for spawning migrations and dispersal of young. The species is adapted to a hydrologic cycle characterized by large spring peaks of snow-melt runoff and low, relatively stable base flows. High spring flows create and maintain in-channel habitats, and reconnect floodplain and riverine habitats, a phenomenon described as the spring flood-pulse (Junk et al. 1989; Johnson et al. 1995). Throughout most of the year, juvenile, subadult, and adult Colorado pikeminnow use relatively deep, low-velocity eddies, pools, and runs that occur in nearshore areas of main river channels (Tyus and McAda 1984; Valdez and Masslich 1989; Tyus 1990, 1991; Osmundson et al. 1995). In spring, however, Colorado pikeminnow adults use floodplain habitats, flooded tributary mouths, flooded side canyons, and eddies that are available only during high flows (Tyus 1990, 1991; Osmundson et al. 1995). Such environments may be particularly beneficial for Colorado pikeminnow because other riverine fishes gather in floodplain habitats to exploit food and temperature resources, and may serve as prey. Such low-velocity environments also may serve as resting areas for Colorado pikeminnow. River reaches of high habitat complexity appear to be preferred.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Because of their mobility and environmental tolerances, adult Colorado pikeminnow are more widely distributed than other life stages. Distribution patterns of adults are stable during most of the year (Tyus 1990, 1991; Irving and Modde 2000), but distribution of adults changes in late spring and early summer, when most mature fish migrate to spawning areas (Tyus and McAda 1984; Tyus 1985, 1990, 1991; Irving and Modde 2000). High spring flows provide an important cue to prepare adults for migration and also ensure that conditions at spawning areas are suitable for reproduction once adults arrive. Specifically, bankfull or much larger floods mobilize coarse sediment to build or reshape cobble bars, and they create side channels that Colorado pikeminnow sometimes use for spawning (Harvey et al. 1993).

Colorado pikeminnow spawning sites in the Green River subbasin have been well documented. The two principal locations are in Yampa Canyon on the lower Yampa River and in Gray Canyon on the lower Green River (Tyus 1990, 1991). These reaches are 42 and 72 km long, respectively, but most spawning is believed to occur at one or two short segments within each of the two reaches. Another spawning area may occur in Desolation Canyon on the lower Green River (Irving and Modde 2000), but the location and importance of this area has not been verified. Although direct observation of Colorado pikeminnow spawning was not possible because of high turbidity, radiotelemetry indicated spawning occurred over cobble-bottomed riffles (Tyus 1990). High spring flows and subsequent post-peak summer flows are important for construction and maintenance of spawning substrates (Harvey et al. 1993). In contrast with the Green River subbasin, where known spawning sites are in canyon-bound reaches, currently suspected spawning sites in the upper Colorado River subbasin are at six locations in meandering, alluvial reaches (McAda 2000).

After hatching and emerging from the spawning substrate, Colorado pikeminnow larvae drift downstream to backwaters in sandy, alluvial regions, where they remain through most of their first year of life (Holden 1977; Tyus and Haines 1991; Muth and Snyder 1995). Backwaters and the physical factors that create them are vital to successful recruitment of early life stages of Colorado pikeminnow, and age-0 Colorado pikeminnow in backwaters have received much research attention (e.g., Tyus and Karp 1989; Haines and Tyus 1990; Tyus 1991; Tyus and Haines 1991; Bestgen et al. 1997). It is important to note that these backwaters are formed after cessation of spring runoff within the active channel and are not floodplain features. Colorado pikeminnow larvae occupy these in-channel backwaters soon after hatching. They tend to occur in backwaters that are large, warm, deep (average, about 0.3 m in the Green River), and turbid (Tyus and Haines 1991). Recent research (Day et al. 1999a, 1999b; Trammell and Chart 1999) has confirmed these preferences and suggested that a particular type of backwater is preferred by Colorado pikeminnow larvae and juveniles. Such backwaters are created when a secondary channel is cut off at the upper end, but remains connected to the river at the downstream end. These chute channels are deep and may persist even when discharge levels change dramatically. An optimal river-reach environment for growth and survival of early life stages of Colorado pikeminnow has warm, relatively stable backwaters, warm river channels, and abundant food (Muth et al. 2000).

Threats to the Species

Major declines in Colorado pikeminnow populations occurred during the dam-building era of the 1930s through the 1960s. Behnke and Benson (1983) summarized the decline of the natural

Mr. Donald Metzler

ecosystem, pointing out that dams, impoundments, and water use practices drastically modified the river's natural hydrology and channel characteristics throughout the Colorado River Basin. Dams on the mainstem broke the natural continuum of the river ecosystem into a series of disjunct segments, blocking native fish migrations, reducing temperatures downstream of dams, creating lacustrine habitat, and providing conditions that allowed competitive and predatory nonnative fishes to thrive both within the impounded reservoirs and in the modified river segments that connect them. The highly modified flow regime in the lower basin coupled with the introduction of nonnative fishes decimated populations of native fish.

The primary threats to Colorado pikeminnow are stream flow regulation and habitat modification; competition with and predation by nonnative fishes; and pesticides and pollutants (USFWS 2002a). The existing habitat, altered by these threats, has been modified to the extent that it impairs essential behavior patterns, such as breeding, feeding, and sheltering. These impairments are described in further detail below.

Stream flow regulation includes mainstem dams that cause the following adverse effects to Colorado pikeminnow and its habitat:

- block migration corridors,
- changes in flow patterns, reduced peak flows and increased base flows,
- release cold water, making temperature regimes less than optimal,
- change river habitat into lake habitat, and
- retain sediment that is important for forming and maintaining backwater habitats

In the Upper Basin, 435 miles of Colorado pikeminnow habitat has been lost by reservoir inundation from Flaming Forge Reservoir on the Green River, Lake Powell on the Colorado River, and Navajo Reservoir on the San Juan River. Cold water releases from these dams have eliminated suitable habitat for native fishes, including Colorado pikeminnow, from river reaches downstream for approximately 50 miles below Flaming Gorge Dam and Navajo Dam. In addition to main stem dams, many dams and water diversion structures occur in and upstream from critical habitat that reduce flows and alter flow patterns, which adversely affect critical habitat. Diversion structures in critical habitat divert fish into canals and pipes where the fish are permanently lost to the river system. It is unknown how many endangered fish are lost in irrigation systems, but in some years, in some river reaches, majority of the river flow is diverted into unscreened canals. High spring flows maintain habitat diversity, flush sediments from spawning habitat, increase invertebrate food production, form gravel and cobble deposits important for spawning, and maintain backwater nursery habitats (McAda 2000; Muth et al. 2000). Peak spring flows in the Green River at Jensen, Utah, have decreased 13–35 percent and base flows have increased 10–140 percent due to regulation by Flaming Gorge Dam (Muth et al. 2000).

Predation and competition from nonnative fishes have been clearly implicated in the population reductions or elimination of native fishes in the Colorado River Basin (Dill 1944, Osmundson and Kaeding 1989, Behnke 1980, Joseph et al. 1977, Lanigan and Berry 1979, Minckley and Deacon 1968, Meffe 1985, Propst and Bestgen 1991, Rinne 1991). Data collected by Osmundson and Kaeding (1991) indicated that during low water years nonnative minnows capable of preying on or competing with larval endangered fishes greatly increased in numbers.

Mr. Donald Metzler

More than 50 nonnative fish species were intentionally introduced in the Colorado River Basin prior to 1980 for sportfishing, forage fish, biological control and ornamental purposes (Minckley 1982, Tyus et al. 1982, Carlson and Muth 1989). Nonnative fishes compete with native fishes in several ways. The capacity of a particular area to support aquatic life is limited by physical habitat conditions. Increasing the number of species in an area usually results in a smaller population of most species. The size of each species population is controlled by the ability of each life stage to compete for space and food resources and to avoid predation. Some life stages of nonnative fishes appear to have a greater ability to compete for space and food and to avoid predation in the existing altered habitat than do some life stages of native fishes. Tyus and Saunders (1996) cite numerous examples of both indirect and direct evidence of predation on razorback sucker eggs and larvae by nonnative species.

Threats from pesticides and pollutants include accidental spills of petroleum products and hazardous materials; discharge of pollutants from uranium mill tailings; and high selenium concentration in the water and food chain (USFWS 2002a). Accidental spills of hazardous material into critical habitat can cause immediate mortality when lethal toxicity levels are exceeded. Pollutants from uranium mill tailings cause high levels of ammonia that exceed water quality standards. High selenium levels may adversely affect reproduction and recruitment (Hamilton and Wiedmeyer 1990; Stephens et al. 1992; Hamilton and Waddell 1994; Hamilton et al. 1996; Stephens and Waddell 1998; Osmundson et al. 2000a).

Management actions identified in the recovery goals for Colorado pikeminnow (USFWS 2002a) to minimize or remove threats to the species included:

- provide and legally protect habitat (including flow regimes necessary to restore and maintain required environmental conditions) necessary to provide adequate habitat and sufficient range for all life stages to support recovered populations;
- provide passage over barriers within occupied habitat to allow adequate movement and, potentially, range expansion;
- investigate options for providing appropriate water temperatures in the Gunnison River;
- minimize entrainment of subadults and adults in diversion canals;
- ensure adequate protection from overutilization;
- ensure adequate protection from diseases and parasites;
- regulate nonnative fish releases and escapement into the main river, floodplain, and tributaries;
- control problematic nonnative fishes as needed;
- minimize the risk of hazardous-materials spills in critical habitat; and
- remediate water-quality problems.

Razorback sucker

Species/Critical Habitat Description

Like all suckers (family Catostomidae, meaning “down mouth”), the razorback sucker has a ventral mouth with thick lips covered with papillae and no scales on its head. In general, suckers

Mr. Donald Metzler

are bottom browsers, sucking up or scraping off small invertebrates, algae, and organic matter with their fleshy, protrusible lips (Moyle 1976). The razorback sucker is the only sucker with an abrupt sharp-edged dorsal keel behind its head. The keel becomes more massive with age. The head and keel are dark, the back is olive-colored, the sides are brownish or reddish, and the abdomen is yellowish white (Sublette et al. 1990). Adults often exceed 3 kg (6 pounds) in weight and 600 mm (2 feet) in length. Like Colorado pikeminnow, razorback suckers are long-lived, living 40-plus years.

Critical habitat was designated for razorback sucker on March 21, 1994 (59 FR 13374).

Designated critical habitat makes up about 49% of the species' original range and occurs in both the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins (USFWS 1994). The primary constituent elements are the same as those described for Colorado pikeminnow.

Critical habitat has been designated within the 100-year floodplain of the razorback sucker's historical range in the following sections of the Upper Basin, excluding the San Juan River Basin (59 FR 13374).

Colorado, Moffat County. The Yampa River and its 100-year floodplain from the mouth of Cross Mountain Canyon in T. 6 N., R. 98 W., section 23 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah County; and Colorado, Moffat County. The Green River and its 100-year floodplain from the confluence with the Yampa River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian) to Sand Wash in T. 11 S., R. 18 E., section 20 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah, Carbon, Grand, Emery, Wayne, and San Juan Counties. The Green River and its 100-year floodplain from Sand Wash at river mile 96 at T. 11 S., R. 18 E., section 20 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Colorado River in T. 30 S., R. 19 E., section 7 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah County. The White River and its 100-year floodplain from the boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation at river mile 18 in T. 9 S., R. 22 E., section 21 (Salt Lake Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 9 S., R. 20 E., section 4 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Uintah County. The Duchesne River and its 100-year floodplain from river mile 2.5 in T. 4 S., R. 3 E., section 30 (Salt Lake Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 5 S., R. 3 E., section 5 (Uintah Meridian).

Colorado, Delta and Mesa Counties. The Gunnison River and its 100-year floodplain from the confluence with the Uncompahgre River in T. 15 S., R. 96 W., section 11 (6th Principal Meridian) to Redlands Diversion Dam in T. 1 S., R. 1 W., section 27 (Ute Meridian).

Mr. Donald Metzler

Colorado, Mesa and Garfield Counties. The Colorado River and its 100-year floodplain from Colorado River Bridge at exit 90 north off Interstate 70 in T. 6 S., R. 93 W., section 16 (6th Principal Meridian) to Westwater Canyon in T. 20 S., R. 25 E., section 12 (Salt Lake Meridian) including the Gunnison River and its 100-year floodplain from the Redlands Diversion Dam in T. 1 S., R. 1 W., section 27 (Ute Meridian) to the confluence with the Colorado River in T. 1 S., R. 1 W., section 22 (Ute Meridian).

Utah, Grand, San Juan, Wayne, and Garfield Counties. The Colorado River and its 100-year floodplain from Westwater Canyon in T. 20 S., R. 25 E., section 12 (Salt Lake Meridian) to full pool elevation, upstream of North Wash, and including the Dirty Devil arm of Lake Powell in T. 33 S., R. 14 E., section 29 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Status and Distribution

On March 14, 1989, the USFWS was petitioned to conduct a status review of the razorback sucker. Subsequently, the razorback sucker was designated as endangered under a final rule published on October 23, 1991 (56 FR 54957). The final rule stated “Little evidence of natural recruitment has been found in the past 30 years, and numbers of adult fish captured in the last 10 years demonstrate a downward trend relative to historic abundance. Significant changes have occurred in razorback sucker habitat through diversion and depletion of water, introduction of nonnative fishes, and construction and operation of dams” (56 FR 54957). Recruitment of razorback suckers to the population continues to be a problem.

Historically, razorback suckers were found in the mainstem Colorado River and major tributaries in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, and in Mexico (Ellis 1914; Minckley 1983). Bestgen (1990) reported that this species was once so numerous that it was commonly used as food by early settlers and, further, that commercially marketable quantities were caught in Arizona as recently as 1949. In the Upper Basin, razorback suckers were reported in the Green River to be very abundant near Green River, Utah, in the late 1800s (Jordan 1891). An account in Osmundson and Kaeding (1989) reported that residents living along the Colorado River near Clifton, Colorado, observed several thousand razorback suckers during spring runoff in the 1930s and early 1940s. In the San Juan River drainage, Platania and Young (1989) relayed historical accounts of razorback suckers ascending the Animas River to Durango, Colorado, around the turn of the century.

Currently, the largest concentration of razorback sucker remaining in the Colorado River Basin is in Lake Mohave on the border of Arizona and California. Estimates of the wild stock in Lake Mohave have fallen precipitously in recent years from 60,000 as late as 1991, to 25,000 in 1993 (Marsh 1993, Holden 1994), to about 9,000 in 2000 (USFWS 2002b). Until recently, efforts to introduce young razorback sucker into Lake Mohave have failed because of predation by non-native species (Minckley et al. 1991, Clarkson et al. 1993, Burke 1994). While limited numbers of razorback suckers persist in other locations in the Lower Colorado River, they are considered rare or incidental and may be continuing to decline.

In the Upper Colorado River Basin, above Glen Canyon Dam, razorback suckers are found in limited numbers in both lentic (lake-like) and riverine environments. The largest populations of razorback suckers in the upper basin are found in the upper Green and lower Yampa rivers (Tyus

Mr. Donald Metzler

1987). In the Colorado River, most razorback suckers occur in the Grand Valley area near Grand Junction, Colorado; however, they are increasingly rare. Osmundson and Kaeding (1991) reported that the number of razorback sucker captures in the Grand Junction area has declined dramatically since 1974. Between 1984 and 1990, intensive collecting effort captured only 12 individuals in the Grand Valley (Osmundson and Kaeding 1991). The wild population of razorback sucker is considered extirpated from the Gunnison River (Burdick and Bonar 1997).

Razorback suckers are in imminent danger of extirpation in the wild. As Bestgen (1990) pointed out:

“Reasons for decline of most native fishes in the Colorado River Basin have been attributed to habitat loss due to construction of mainstream dams and subsequent interruption or alteration of natural flow and physio-chemical regimes, inundation of river reaches by reservoirs, channelization, water quality degradation, introduction of nonnative fish species and resulting competitive interactions or predation, and other man-induced disturbances (Miller 1961, Joseph et al. 1977, Behnke and Benson 1983, Carlson and Muth 1989, Tyus and Karp 1989). These factors are almost certainly not mutually exclusive, therefore it is often difficult to determine exact cause and effect relationships.”

The virtual absence of any recruitment suggests a combination of biological, physical, and/or chemical factors that may be affecting the survival and recruitment of early life stages of razorback suckers. Within the Upper Basin, recovery efforts endorsed by the Recovery Program include the capture and removal of razorback suckers from all known locations for genetic analyses and development of discrete brood stocks. These measures have been undertaken to develop refugia populations of the razorback sucker from the same genetic parentage as their wild counterparts such that, if these fish are genetically unique by subbasin or individual population, then separate stocks will be available for future augmentation. Such augmentation may be a necessary step to prevent the extinction of razorback suckers in the Upper Basin.

Recovery goals for the razorback sucker (USFWS 2002b) were approved on August 1, 2002. According to these recovery goals, downlisting can be considered if, over a 5-year period:

- genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the Green River subbasin and either in the upper Colorado River subbasin or the San Juan River subbasin such that (a) the trend in adult (age 4+; > 400 mm total length) point estimates for each of the two populations does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 (300–399 mm total length) naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the two populations, and (c) each point estimate for each of the two populations exceeds 5,800 adults (5,800 is the estimated minimum viable population needed to ensure long-term genetic and demographic viability); and
- a genetic refuge is maintained in Lake Mohave of the lower basin recovery unit; and

Mr. Donald Metzler

- two genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the lower basin recovery unit (e.g., mainstem and/or tributaries) such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each population does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each population, and (c) each point estimate for each population exceeds 5,800 adults; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been identified, developed, and implemented.

Delisting can be considered if, over a 3-year period beyond downlisting:

- genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the Green River subbasin and either in the upper Colorado River subbasin or the San Juan River subbasin such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each of the two populations does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the two populations, and (c) each point estimate for each of the two populations exceeds 5,800 adults; and
- a genetic refuge is maintained in Lake Mohave; and
- two genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the lower basin recovery unit such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each population does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each population, and (c) each point estimate for each population exceeds 5,800 adults; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been finalized and implemented, and necessary levels of protection are attained.

Life History

McAda and Wydoski (1980) and Tyus (1987) reported springtime aggregations of razorback suckers in off-channel habitats and tributaries; such aggregations are believed to be associated with reproductive activities. Tyus and Karp (1990) and Osmundson and Kaeding (1991) reported off-channel habitats to be much warmer than the mainstem river and that razorback suckers presumably moved to these areas for feeding, resting, sexual maturation, spawning, and other activities associated with their reproductive cycle. Prior to construction of large mainstem dams and the suppression of spring peak flows, low velocity, off-channel habitats (seasonally flooded bottomlands and shorelines) were commonly available throughout the Upper Basin (Tyus and Karp 1989; Osmundson and Kaeding 1991). Dams changed riverine ecosystems into lakes by impounding water, which eliminated these off-channel habitats in reservoirs. Reduction in spring peak flows eliminates or reduces the frequency of inundation of off-channel habitats.

Mr. Donald Metzler

The absence of these seasonally flooded riverine habitats is believed to be a limiting factor in the successful recruitment of razorback suckers in their native environment (Tyus and Karp 1989; Osmundson and Kaeding 1991). Wydoski and Wick (1998) identified starvation of larval razorback suckers due to low zooplankton densities in the main channel and loss of floodplain habitats which provide adequate zooplankton densities for larval food as one of the most important factors limiting recruitment.

While razorback suckers have never been directly observed spawning in turbid riverine environments within the Upper Basin, captures of ripe specimens (in spawning condition), both males and females, have been recorded (Valdez et al. 1982a; McAda and Wydoski 1980; Tyus 1987; Osmundson and Kaeding 1989; Tyus and Karp 1989; Tyus and Karp 1990; Osmundson and Kaeding 1991; Platania 1990) in the Yampa, Green, Colorado, and San Juan rivers. Sexually mature razorback suckers are generally collected on the ascending limb of the hydrograph from mid-April through June and are associated with coarse gravel substrates (depending on the specific location).

Outside of the spawning season, adult razorback suckers occupy a variety of shoreline and main channel habitats including slow runs, shallow to deep pools, backwaters, eddies, and other relatively slow velocity areas associated with sand substrates (Tyus 1987; Tyus and Karp 1989; Osmundson and Kaeding 1989; Valdez and Masslich 1989; Osmundson and Kaeding 1991; Tyus and Karp 1990).

Habitat requirements of young and juvenile razorback suckers in the wild are not well known, particularly in native riverine environments. Prior to 1991, the last confirmed documentation of a razorback sucker juvenile in the Upper Basin was a capture in the Colorado River near Moab, Utah (Taba et al. 1965). In 1991, two early juvenile (36.6 and 39.3 mm total length (TL)) razorback suckers were collected in the lower Green River near Hell Roaring Canyon (Gutermuth et al. 1994). Juvenile razorback suckers have been collected in recent years from Old Charley Wash, a wetland adjacent to the Green River (Modde 1996). Between 1992 and 1995 larval razorback suckers were collected in the middle and lower Green River and within the Colorado River inflow to Lake Powell (Muth 1995). In 2002, eight larval razorback suckers were collected in the Gunnison River (Osmundson 2002b). No young razorback suckers have been collected in recent times in the Colorado River.

Threats to the Species

A marked decline in populations of razorback suckers can be attributed to construction of dams and reservoirs, introduction of nonnative fishes, and removal of large quantities of water from the Colorado River system. Dams on the mainstem Colorado River and its major tributaries have segmented the river system, blocked migration routes, and changed river habitat into lake habitat. Dams also have drastically altered flows, temperatures, and channel geomorphology. These changes have modified habitats in many areas so that they are no longer suitable for breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Major changes in species composition have occurred due to the introduction of numerous nonnative fishes, many of which have thrived due to human-induced changes to the natural riverine system. These nonnative fishes prey upon and compete with razorback suckers.

Mr. Donald Metzler

The primary threats to razorback sucker are stream flow regulation and habitat modification; competition with and predation by nonnative fishes; and pesticides and pollutants (USFWS 2002b). The existing habitat, altered by these threats, has been modified to the extent that it impairs essential behavior patterns, such as breeding, feeding, and sheltering. The threats to razorback sucker are essentially the same threats identified for Colorado pikeminnow.

Management actions identified in the recovery goals for razorback sucker (USFWS 2002b) to minimize or remove threats to the species included:

- provide and legally protect habitat (including flow regimes necessary to restore and maintain required environmental conditions) necessary to provide adequate habitat and sufficient range for all life stages to support recovered populations;
- provide passage over barriers within occupied habitat to allow unimpeded movement and, potentially, range expansion;
- investigate options for providing appropriate water temperatures in the Gunnison River;
- minimize entrainment of subadults and adults in diversion/out-take structures;
- ensure adequate protection from overutilization;
- ensure adequate protection from diseases and parasites;
- regulate nonnative fish releases and escapement into the main river, floodplain, and tributaries;
- control problematic nonnative fishes as needed;
- minimize the risk of hazardous-materials spills in critical habitat;
- remediate water-quality problems; and
- minimize the threat of hybridization with white sucker.

Humpback chub

Species/Critical Habitat Description

The humpback chub is a medium-sized freshwater fish (less than 500 mm) of the minnow family. The adults have a pronounced dorsal hump, a narrow flattened head, a fleshy snout with an inferior-subterminal mouth, and small eyes. It has silvery sides with a brown or olive colored back.

The humpback chub is endemic to the Colorado River Basin and is part of a native fish fauna traced to the Miocene epoch in fossil records (Miller 1946; Minckley et al. 1986). Humpback chub remains have been dated to about 4000 B.C., but the fish was not described as a species until the 1940s (Miller 1946), presumably because of its restricted distribution in remote white water canyons (USFWS 1990). Because of this, its original distribution is not known. The humpback chub was listed as endangered on March 11, 1967.

Until the 1950s, the humpback chub was known only from Grand Canyon. During surveys in the 1950s and 1960s humpback chub were found in the upper Green River including specimens from Echo Park, Island Park, and Swallow Canyon (Smith 1960, Vanicek et al. 1970). Individuals

Mr. Donald Metzler

were also reported from the lower Yampa River (Holden and Stalnaker 1975b), the White River in Utah (Sigler and Miller 1963), Desolation Canyon of the Green River (Holden and Stalnaker 1970) and the Colorado River near Moab (Sigler and Miller 1963).

Critical habitat was designated for humpback chub on March 21, 1994 (59 FR 13374). Designated critical habitat makes up about 28% of the species' original range and occurs in both the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins. The primary constituent elements are the same as those described for Colorado pikeminnow.

Critical habitat has been designated within the humpback chub's historical range in the following sections of the Upper Basin (59 FR 13374).

Colorado, Moffat County. The Yampa River from the boundary of Dinosaur National Monument in T. 6 N., R. 99 W., section 27 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah County; and Colorado, Moffat County. The Green River from the confluence with the Yampa River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian) to the southern boundary of Dinosaur National Monument in T. 6 N., R. 24 E., section 30 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Uintah and Grand Counties. The Green River (Desolation and Gray Canyons) from Sumners Amphitheater in T. 12 S., R. 18 E., section 5 (Salt Lake Meridian) to Swasey's Rapid in T. 20 S., R. 16 E., section 3 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Grand County; and Colorado, Mesa County. The Colorado River from Black Rocks in T. 10 S., R. 104 W., section 25 (6th Principal Meridian) to Fish Ford in T. 21 S., R. 24 E., section 35 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Garfield and San Juan Counties. The Colorado River from Brown Betty Rapid in T. 30 S., R. 18 E., section 34 (Salt Lake Meridian) to Imperial Canyon in T. 31 S., R. 17 E., section 28 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Status and Distribution

Failure to recognize *Gila cypha* as a species until 1946 complicated interpretation of historic distribution of humpback chubs in the Green River (Douglas et al. 1989, 1998). Best available information suggests that before Flaming Gorge Dam, humpback chubs were distributed in canyon regions throughout much of the Green River, from the present site of Flaming Gorge Reservoir downstream through Desolation and Gray canyons (Vanicek 1967; Holden and Stalnaker 1975a; Holden 1991). In addition, the species occurred in the Yampa and White rivers. Pre-impoundment surveys of the Flaming Gorge Reservoir basin (Bosley 1960; Gaufin et al. 1960; McDonald and Dotson 1960; Smith 1960) reported both humpback chubs and bonytails from the Green River near Hideout Canyon, now inundated by Flaming Gorge Reservoir.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Historic collection records of humpback chub exist from the Yampa and White rivers, both tributaries to the Green River. Tyus (1998) verified the presence of seven humpback chubs in collections of the University of Colorado Museum, collected from the Yampa River in Castle Park between 19 June and 11 July 1948. A single humpback chub was found in the White River near Bonanza, Utah, in June 1981 (Miller et al. 1982b), and a possible bonytail-humpback chub intergrade was also captured in July 1978 (Lanigan and Berry 1981).

Present concentrations of humpback chub in the Upper Basin occur in canyon-bound river reaches ranging in length from 3.7 km (Black Rocks) to 40.5 km (Desolation and Gray Canyons). Humpback chubs are distributed throughout most of Black Rocks and Westwater Canyons (12.9 km), and in or near whitewater reaches of Cataract Canyon (20.9 km), Desolation and Gray Canyons (65.2 km), and Yampa Canyon (44.3 km), with populations in the separate canyon reaches ranging from 400 to 5,000 adults (see population dynamics). The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources has monitored the fish community in Desolation and Gray Canyons since 1989 and has consistently reported captures of age-0, juvenile, and adult *Gila*, including humpback chub, indicating a reproducing population (Chart and Lentsch 1999b). Distribution of humpback chubs within Whirlpool and Split Mountain Canyons is not presently known, but it is believed that numbers of humpback chub in these sections of the Green River are low.

The Yampa River is the only tributary to the Green River presently known to support a reproducing humpback chub population. Between 1986 and 1989, Karp and Tyus (1990) collected 130 humpback chubs from Yampa Canyon and indicated that a small but reproducing population was present. Continuing captures of juveniles and adults within Dinosaur National Monument indicate that a population persists in Yampa Canyon (T. Modde, U.S. Fish and Wildlife USFWS, personal communication). Small numbers of humpback chub also have been reported in Cross Mountain Canyon on the Yampa River and in the Little Snake River about 10 km upstream of its confluence with the Yampa River (Wick et al. 1981; Hawkins et al. 1996).

Recovery goals for the humpback chub (USFWS 2002c) were approved on August 1, 2002. According to these recovery goals, downlisting can be considered if, over a 5-year period:

- the trend in adult (age 4+; > 200 mm total length) point estimates for each of the six extant populations does not decline significantly; and
- mean estimated recruitment of age-3 (150–199 mm total length) naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the six extant populations; and
- two genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining core populations are maintained, such that each point estimate for each core population exceeds 2,100 adults (2,100 is the estimated minimum viable population needed to ensure long-term genetic and demographic viability); and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been identified, developed, and implemented.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Delisting can be considered if, over a 3-year period beyond downlisting:

- the trend in adult point estimates for each of the six extant populations does not decline significantly; and
- mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the six extant populations; and
- three genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining core populations are maintained, such that each point estimate for each core population exceeds 2,100 adults; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been finalized and implemented, and necessary levels of protection are attained.

Life History

Unlike Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, which are known to make extended migrations of up to several hundred miles to spawning areas in the Green and Yampa rivers, humpback chubs in the Green River do not appear to make extensive migrations (Karp and Tyus 1990). Radio-telemetry and tagging studies on other humpback chub populations have revealed strong fidelity by adults for specific locations with little movement to areas outside of home canyon regions. Humpback chubs in Black Rocks (Valdez and Clemmer 1982), Westwater Canyon (Chart and Lentsch 1999a), and Desolation and Gray Canyons (Chart and Lentsch 1999b) do not migrate to spawn.

Generally, humpback chub show fidelity for canyon reaches and move very little (Miller et al. 1982a; Archer et al. 1985; Burdick and Kaeding 1985; Kaeding et al. 1990). Movements of adult humpback chub in Black Rocks on the Colorado River were essentially restricted to a 1-mile reach. These results were based on the recapture of Carlin-tagged fish and radiotelemetry studies conducted from 1979 to 1981 (Valdez et al. 1982) and 1983 to 1985 (Archer et al. 1985; USFWS 1986; Kaeding et al. 1990).

In the Green River and upper Colorado River, humpback chubs spawned in spring and summer as flows declined shortly after the spring peak (Valdez and Clemmer 1982; Valdez et al. 1982; Kaeding and Zimmerman 1983; Tyus and Karp 1989; Karp and Tyus 1990; Chart and Lentsch 1999a, 1999b). Similar spawning patterns were reported from Grand Canyon (Kaeding and Zimmerman 1983; Valdez and Ryel 1995, 1997). Little is known about spawning habitats and behavior of humpback chub. Although humpback chub are believed to broadcast eggs over mid-channel cobble and gravel bars, spawning in the wild has not been observed for this species. Gorman and Stone (1999) reported that ripe male humpback chubs in the Little Colorado River aggregated in areas of complex habitat structure (i.e., matrix of large boulders and travertine masses combined with chutes, runs, and eddies, 0.5–2.0 m deep) and were associated with deposits of clean gravel.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Chart and Lentsch (1999b) estimated hatching dates for young *Gila* collected from Desolation and Gray Canyons between 1992 and 1995. They determined that hatching occurred on the descending limb of the hydrograph as early as 9 June 1992 at a flow of 139 m³/s and as late as 1 July 1995 at a flow of 731 m³/s. Instantaneous daily river temperatures on hatching dates over all years ranged from 20 to 22°C.

Newly hatched larvae average 6.3–7.5 mm TL (Holden 1973; Suttkus and Clemmer 1977; Minckley 1973; Snyder 1981; Hamman 1982; Behnke and Benson 1983; Muth 1990), and 1-month-old fish are approximately 20 mm long (Hamman 1982). Unlike Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, no evidence exists of long-distance larval drift (Miller and Hubert 1990; Robinson et al. 1998). Upon emergence from spawning gravels, humpback chub larvae remain in the vicinity of bottom surfaces (Marsh 1985) near spawning areas (Chart and Lentsch 1999a).

Backwaters, eddies, and runs have been reported as common capture locations for young-of-year humpback chub (Valdez and Clemmer 1982). These data indicate that in Black Rocks and Westwater Canyon, young utilize shallow areas. Habitat suitability index curves developed by Valdez et al. (1990) indicate young-of-year prefer average depths of 2.1 feet with a maximum of 5.1 feet. Average velocities were reported at 0.2 feet per second.

Valdez et al. (1982) Wick et al. (1979) and Wick et al. (1981) found adult humpback chub in Black Rocks and Westwater Canyons in water averaging 50 feet in depth with a maximum depth of 92 feet. In these localities, humpback chub were associated with large boulders and steep cliffs.

Threats to the Species

Although historic data are limited, the apparent range-wide decline in humpback chubs is likely due to a combination of factors including alteration of river habitats by reservoir inundation, changes in stream discharge and temperature, competition with and predation by introduced fish species, and other factors such as changes in food resources resulting from stream alterations (USFWS 1990).

The primary threats to humpback chub are stream flow regulation and habitat modification; competition with and predation by nonnative fishes; parasitism; hybridization with other native *Gila* species; and pesticides and pollutants (USFWS 2002c). The existing habitat, altered by these threats, has been modified to the extent that it impairs essential behavior patterns, such as breeding, feeding, and sheltering. The threats to humpback chub in relation to flow regulation and habitat modification, predation by nonnative fishes, and pesticides and pollutants are essentially the same threats identified for Colorado pikeminnow.

The humpback chub population in the Grand Canyon is threatened by predation from nonnative trout in the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. This population is also threatened by the Asian tapeworm reported in humpback chub in the Little Colorado River (USFWS 2002c). No Asian tapeworms have been reported in the upper basin populations.

Hybridization with roundtail chub (*Gila robusta*) and bonytail, where they occur with humpback chub, is recognized as a threat to humpback chub. A larger proportion of roundtail chub have

Mr. Donald Metzler

been found in Black Rocks and Westwater Canyon during low flow years (Kaeding et al. 1990; Chart and Lentsch 2000), which increase the chances for hybridization.

Management actions identified in the recovery goals for humpback chub (USFWS 2002c) to minimize or remove threats to the species included:

- provide and legally protect habitat (including flow regimes necessary to restore and maintain required environmental conditions) necessary to provide adequate habitat and sufficient range for all life stages to support recovered populations,
- investigate the role of the mainstem Colorado River in maintaining the Grand Canyon population,
- investigate the anticipated effects of and options for providing warmer water temperatures in the mainstem Colorado River through Grand Canyon,
- ensure adequate protection from overutilization,
- ensure adequate protection from diseases and parasites,
- regulate nonnative fish releases and escapement into the main river, floodplain, and tributaries,
- control problematic nonnative fishes as needed,
- minimize the risk of increased hybridization among *Gila* spp, and
- minimize the risk of hazardous-materials spills in critical habitat.

Bonytail

Species/Critical Habitat Description

Bonytail are medium-sized (less than 600 mm) fish in the minnow family. Adult bonytail are gray or olive colored on the back with silvery sides and a white belly. The adult bonytail has an elongated body with a long, thin caudal peduncle. The head is small and compressed compared to the rest of the body. The mouth is slightly overhung by the snout and there is a smooth low hump behind the head that is not as pronounced as the hump on a humpback chub.

The bonytail is endemic to the Colorado River Basin and was historically common to abundant in warm-water reaches of larger rivers of the basin from Mexico to Wyoming. The species experienced a dramatic, but poorly documented, decline starting in about 1950, following construction of several mainstem dams, introduction of nonnative fishes, poor land-use practices, and degraded water quality (USFWS 2002d).

Currently, no self-sustaining populations of bonytail are known to exist in the wild, and very few individuals have been caught anywhere within the basin. An unknown, but small number of wild adults exist in Lake Mohave on the mainstem Colorado River. Since 1977, only 11 wild adults have been reported from the upper basin (Valdez et al. 1994).

A total of 499 km (312 miles) of river has been designated as critical habitat for the bonytail in the Colorado River Basin, representing about 14% of the species' historic range (59 FR 13374). The primary constituent elements are the same as those described for the Colorado pikeminnow.

Mr. Donald Metzler

Critical habitat has been designated within the bonytail's historical range in the following sections of the Upper Basin (59 FR 13374).

Colorado, Moffat County. The Yampa River from the boundary of Dinosaur National Monument in T. 6 N., R. 99 W., section 27 (6th Principal Meridian) to the confluence with the Green River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian).

Utah, Uintah County; and Colorado, Moffat County. The Green River from the confluence with the Yampa River in T. 7 N., R. 103 W., section 28 (6th Principal Meridian) to the boundary of Dinosaur National Monument in T. 6 N., R. 24 E., section 30 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Uintah and Grand Counties. The Green River (Desolation and Gray Canyons) from Sumner's Amphitheater (river mile 85) in T. 12 S., R. 18 E., section 5 (Salt Lake Meridian) to Swasey's Rapid (river mile 12) in T. 20 S., R. 16 E., section 3 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Grand County; and Colorado, Mesa County. The Colorado River from Black Rocks in T. 10 S., R. 104 W., section 25 (6th Principal Meridian) to Fish Ford in T. 21 S., R. 24 E., section 35 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Utah, Garfield and San Juan Counties. The Colorado River from Brown Betty Rapid in T. 30 S., R. 18 E., section 34 (Salt Lake Meridian) to Imperial Canyon in T. 31 S., R. 17 E., section 28 (Salt Lake Meridian).

Status and Distribution

The bonytail is the rarest native fish in the Colorado River. Little is known about its specific habitat requirements or cause of decline, because the bonytail was extirpated from most of its historic range prior to extensive fishery surveys. It was listed as endangered on April 23, 1980. Currently, no documented self-sustaining populations exist in the wild. Formerly reported as widespread and abundant in mainstem rivers (Jordan and Evermann 1896), its populations have been greatly reduced. Remnant populations presently occur in the wild in low numbers in Lake Mohave and several fish have been captured in Lake Powell and Lake Havasu (USFWS 2002d). The last known riverine area where bonytail were common was the Green River in Dinosaur National Monument, where Vanicek (1967) and Holden and Stalnaker (1970) collected 91 specimens during 1962-1966. From 1977 to 1983, no bonytail were collected from the Colorado or Gunnison rivers in Colorado or Utah (Wick et al. 1979, 1981; Valdez et al. 1982; Miller et al. 1984). However, in 1984, a single bonytail was collected from Black Rocks on the Colorado River (Kaeding et al. 1986). Several suspected bonytail were captured in Cataract Canyon in 1985-1987 (Valdez 1990). Current stocking plans for bonytail identify the middle Green River and the Yampa River in Dinosaur National Monument as the highest priority for stocking in Colorado and the plan calls for 2,665 fish to be stocked per year over the next six years (Nesler et al. 2003).

Recovery goals for the bonytail (USFWS 2002d) were approved on August 1, 2002. According to these recovery goals, downlisting can be considered if, over a 5-year period:

- genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the Green River subbasin and upper Colorado River subbasin such that (a) the trend in adult (age 4+; > 250 mm total length) point estimates for each of the two populations does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 (150–249 mm total length) naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the two populations, and (c) each point estimate for each of the two populations exceeds 4,400 adults (4,400 is the estimated minimum viable population needed to ensure long-term genetic and demographic viability); and
- a genetic refuge is maintained in a suitable location (e.g., Lake Mohave, Lake Havasu) in the lower basin recovery unit; and
- two genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the lower basin recovery unit (e.g., mainstem and/or tributaries) such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each population does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each population, and (c) each point estimate for each population exceeds 4,400 adults; and
- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been identified, developed, and implemented.

Delisting can be considered if, over a 3-year period beyond downlisting:

- genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the Green River subbasin and upper Colorado River subbasin such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each of the two populations does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each of the two populations, and (c) each point estimate for each of the two populations exceeds 4,400 adults; and
- a genetic refuge is maintained in the lower basin recovery unit; and
- two genetically and demographically viable, self-sustaining populations are maintained in the lower basin recovery unit such that (a) the trend in adult point estimates for each population does not decline significantly, and (b) mean estimated recruitment of age-3 naturally produced fish equals or exceeds mean annual adult mortality for each population, and (c) each point estimate for each population exceeds 4,400 adults; and

Mr. Donald Metzler

- certain site-specific management tasks to minimize or remove threats have been finalized and implemented, and necessary levels of protection are attained.

Life History

The bonytail is considered a species that is adapted to mainstem rivers, where it has been observed in pools and eddies (Vanicek 1967; Minckley 1973). Spawning of bonytail has never been observed in a river, but ripe fish were collected in Dinosaur National Monument during late June and early July suggesting that spawning occurred at water temperatures of about 18°C (Vanicek and Kramer 1969). Similar to other closely related *Gila* species, bonytail probably spawn in rivers in spring over rocky substrates; spawning has been observed in reservoirs over rocky shoals and shorelines. It has been recently hypothesized that flooded bottomlands may provide important bonytail nursery habitat. Of five specimens captured most recently in the upper basin, four were captured in deep, swift, rocky canyons (Yampa Canyon, Black Rocks, Cataract Canyon, and Coal Creek Rapid), but the fifth was taken in Lake Powell. Since 1974, all bonytails captured in the lower basin were caught in reservoirs.

Threats to the Species

The primary threats to bonytail are stream flow regulation and habitat modification; competition with and predation by nonnative fishes; hybridization with other native *Gila* species; and pesticides and pollutants (USFWS 2002d). The existing habitat, altered by these threats, has been modified to the extent that it impairs essential behavior patterns, such as breeding, feeding, and sheltering. The threats to bonytail in relation to flow regulation and habitat modification, predation by nonnative fishes, and pesticides and pollutants are essentially the same threats identified for Colorado pikeminnow. Threats to bonytail in relation to hybridization are essentially the same threats identified for humpback chub.

Management actions identified in the recovery goals for bonytail (USFWS 2002d) to minimize or remove threats to the species included:

- provide and legally protect habitat (including flow regimes necessary to restore and maintain required environmental conditions) necessary to provide adequate habitat and sufficient range for all life stages to support recovered populations;
- provide passage over barriers within occupied habitat to allow unimpeded movement and, potentially, range expansion;
- investigate options for providing appropriate water temperatures in the Gunnison River;
- minimize entrainment of subadults and adults at diversion/out-take structures;
- investigate habitat requirements for all life stages and provide those habitats;
- ensure adequate protection from overutilization;
- ensure adequate protection from diseases and parasites;
- regulate nonnative fish releases and escapement into the main river, floodplain, and tributaries;
- control problematic nonnative fishes as needed;

Mr. Donald Metzler

- minimize the risk of increased hybridization among *Gila* spp.;
- minimize the risk of hazardous-materials spills in critical habitat; and
- remediate water-quality problems.

Analysis of the species/critical habitat likely to be affected

In summary, the four species of endangered Colorado River fish and their critical habitat are likely to be adversely affected by components of the proposed action. These species will be considered further in the remaining sections of this biological opinion.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline includes the status of the species within the action area (the Colorado River near Moab, Utah) as well as the factors affecting the environment of the species or critical habitat in the action area. The baseline includes; State, tribal, local and private actions already affecting the species or that will occur contemporaneously with the consultation in progress; unrelated Federal actions affecting the same species or critical habitat that have completed formal or informal consultation; and Federal and other actions within the action area that may benefit listed species or critical habitat. The environmental baseline does not include the effects of the action under review in the consultation.

Status of the Species Within the Action Area

Colorado pikeminnow

Colorado pikeminnow are distributed throughout the Colorado River from Price Stubb Dam, an impassible barrier at the upper end of the Grand Valley (RM 188.3), downstream to Lake Powell (Osmundson and Burnham 1998). The Recovery Program is scheduled to provide passage at the structure, but it currently remains an obstacle to fish movement.

Although Colorado pikeminnow use the entire river, there are distinct differences in distribution among age classes. In general, most adults are found in the upper reaches of the river and most subadults, juveniles, and YOY are found in the lower reaches (Valdez et al. 1982a; Archer et al. 1985; McAda and Kaeding 1991b; Osmundson et al. 1997). This corresponds to the general distribution of different age classes in the Green River as well (Tyus 1991). Osmundson and Burnham (1998) conducted an intensive river-wide study using mark-recapture to estimate the population size of subadult (250–500 mm long) and adult Colorado pikeminnow (>500 mm long) in the Colorado River. They divided the river into two subreaches — Westwater Canyon to Price Stubb Dam (RM 125–188) and confluence with Green River to Westwater Canyon (RM 0–113; Westwater Canyon itself was not sampled). They estimated that the average population size in 1991–1994 was 253 (95% CI, 161–440) for the upper reach and 344 (95% CI, 196–604) for the lower reach. They noted that almost all fish captured in the upper reach were adults (i.e. >500 mm), whereas most fish captured from the lower reach were subadults.